

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 53-75 are pending.

Claims 1-13 and 53-75 stand rejected.

Claims 58-74 have been amended to replace “computer program product” with “computer readable medium”.

Claims 1, 58, and 75 have been amended for clarity to replace “a second configuration” with the “the second configuration”.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5-10, 58, 62-66, and 70-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,383 to Henson (hereinafter “*Henson I*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,035,816 to Henson (hereinafter “*Henson II*”).

Applicants respectfully submit that *Henson I* in view of *Henson II* fails to teach or suggest, for example, “receiv[ing] at least first and second configurations of the product, wherein the first and second configurations of the product are sent at one time by a user” as required by claims 1, 58, and 75.

The Office Action, citing *Henson II*, col. 8, lines 26-38 & Fig. 5, states that *Henson II* teaches that “in addition, each alternate recommendation includes a change in price indication.” Office Action, p. 2. “Lead time advisor 74 calculates the change in price differential by taking the difference between the price of the prior component and price of the at least one recommendation.” However, Applicants respectfully disagree that such teaching teaches “receiv[ing] at least first and second configurations of the product, wherein the first and second configurations of the product are sent at one time by a user”. Claims 1, 58, and 75.

Henson II teaches that “Lead time advisor 74 outputs at least one recommendation 94 as to a suitable, lower lead time replacement option, the replacement option being associated with a corresponding long lead time option.” *Henson II*, col. 7, lines 62-65. *Henson II* teaches that the “lead time advisor 74” is part of the “BTO computer manufacturer website”. *Henson II*, col. 4, lines 56-58, col. 5, lines 30-47, and Figure 2. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that “each alternative recommendation” cited by the Examiner as teaching ““receiv[ing] at least first and

second configurations of the product, wherein the first and second configurations of the product are sent at one time by a user” is not “sent at one time by a user” but is actually provided by the manufacturer website. Claims 1, 58, and 75.

Henson I also refers to “merchandising recommendations”. However, *Henson I*, col. 7, lines 23-24 also teaches that the recommendations are provided “to the customer” not “sent at one time by a user” as required by claims 1, 58, and 75.

Exemplary support for “receiv[ing] at least first and second configurations of the product, wherein the first and second configurations of the product are sent at one time by a user” is found in the Present Application on page 11, lines 23-27. Note, the invention is defined by the claims and not by specific embodiments described in the Present Application.

Applicants respectfully submit that since *Henson I* in view of *Henson II* does not teach or suggest “receiv[ing] at least first and second configurations of the product, wherein the first and second configurations of the product are sent at one time by a user”, *Henson I* in view of *Henson II* also do not teach or suggest:

generating a price of the second configuration of the product in response to the received second configuration of the product; and
providing the modified price, the delta price, and the price of the second configuration of the product to a computer system of a user to indicate to the user a pricing impact associated with the modification of the configuration and a comparison of the modified price of the first configuration and the price of the second configuration of the product.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 58, and 75 are allowable over *Henson*. For at least the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims directly or indirectly dependent upon claims 1 and 58 are allowable over *Henson*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4, 11-13, 59-61, and 67-69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Henson I* and *Henson II* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0088431 to Hara et al. (hereinafter “*Hara*”).

Hara relates to an “automatic price correcting system in which the seller and the buyer communicate with each other via network.” *Hara*, Abstract. Applicants respectfully submit

that, like *Henson I* in view of *Henson II*, *Hara* also does not teach “receiv[ing] at least first and second configurations of the product, wherein the first and second configurations of the product are sent at one time **by a user**” as required by claims 1, 58, and 75. For example, Figs. 6-9 of *Hara* each teach one configuration of “Commodity A” received at one time.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 58, and 75 are allowable over *Henson* in view of *Hara*. For at least the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4, 11-13, 59-61, and 67-69, directly or indirectly dependent upon claims 1 and 58, are allowable over *Henson I* in view of *Henson II* and *Hara*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY
June 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839